GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1896-1897
~~19~~
(Muzrai)

File No. 47

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month May 1906.

SUBJECT.

File relating to the appeal petition of Bellamma complaining against the order passed by the Mysore district deputy Commissioner regarding the right of poojaridhip of Sri Anjaneya Swamis Temple at Seeru Mysore Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.

Mysore Department.

Memo

Subject

Appeal petition No 2949 dated the 9th May 1893, from one Bettamma, Pujaree of Veerangere Anjaneyaswamy temple, Mysore against the order dated 20th December 1892: passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, in Miscellaneous Revenue Appeal No 33 of 1892-3.

The following are the facts of the case: —

1. On the 8th July 1841, one Venkatakrishniah, minor son of Chika Venkatiah, Archak of Veerangere Anjaneyaswamy temple in Mysore, through his mother and guardian Narsamma, presented a petition to the Amildar stating that his father Chika Venkatiah and one Bettamma (present Appellant) were both Archaks of Veerangere Anjaneyaswamy temple each performing the duties thereof by monthly turns, that the said Chika Venkatiah died in the month of Vaisakha of the year Vikruti (1890-91)

The Dy Commr's decision is not correct. Eachan Venkata Krishnayya has a right to make Puja as he has a share of the hire. he has no right, he cannot have 2½ Rs - if he has Govt. chosen not to recognise an arrangement which takes away the remuneration from the performer of the service. Right to make Puja appears to me to be a civil right, not barred from the cognisance

when it was his turn to perform the Pooja in the temple, that at the time of his father's death, he (Venkatakrishniah) being a minor and under pollution, it was arranged with the aid of Panchayetdars that Bettamma (Appellant) should herself have the Pooja falling to his turn duly performed and pay him for his share, a sum of Rs 2/8 per month this engagement ceasing whenever he (Venkata-Krishniah) desired it, that a written Karar to the above effect had been drawn up at the time and that Bettamma (Appellant) having fraudulently obtained possession of the Karar refused to give up to him his turn of Pooja service, even though frequently asked to do so. Venkata Krishniah therefore prayed that orders might be issued allowing him to perform himself the Pooja services of his turn.

2. In the enquiry that followed before the Amildar Bettamma (Appeal petitioner) admitted* that both herself and

of Courts by Sec 221 of the L R Code. I do not know what view the Chief Court have finally taken on the point — I shall be glad to know the opinion of the Members thereof before giving my own — If it is a Civil question I would refer the parties to Civil Courts, & let Bettamma pay the whole allowance till the other party's right is established

7/5/94

* 13th January 01
The present dispute is in respect between

are in dealt in [illegible]
of such rights being
adjudicated by the Civil
Cts. That now the Inspr. of
Depts. is entering under fast
suspension Management
and the Deputies / employees
are allowed to do duty
and receive the fees attached
to the offices from the
" passed by Office of Inspr. of
Depts, I think it is only
that all such disputes
as are here referred should
be adjudicated & settled
by fact in the Inspr. Depts
without driving the parties
to Civil Cts. - Legislation seems
necessary ---

A memo prepared
by the Joint Secretaries" quoting instances
the several decisions passed
by the Govt is placed with
these papers.

A. J. Thumboo
21. 5 24

Venkatakrishniah were Archaks of the temple, each doing duty by monthly turns, but stated that according to the agreement entered into with Narsammah (widow of Chika Venkatiah and mother of Venkatakrishniah) at the time of the said Venkatiah's death, she (Bettamma) was to have the whole Pooja of the temple for a period of 5 years on condition of her paying a monthly sum of Rs 2/8 to Venkatakrishniah, that the agreement was only an oral one not reduced to writing, that only a year had elapsed since the contract was entered into and four more years had to run and that she would therefore give up to Venkatakrishnia his Pooja turn only after the expiry of the Contract period of five years.

3. A few witnesses were examined on either side, those for Venkatakrishniah deposing, that the contract between Venkatakrishniah and Bettamma was a written one and was intended to cease whenever the former desired it, while those for Bettamma stated that the contract in question was only

an oral one and was to extend for a period of five years.

4. Thereupon the Amildar submitted the papers for the orders of the District Muzrai officer In his report,* the Amildar stated that the temple in question was one under Government management, and had a Jaedik of Rs 4-5-6 per month for Padilara expenses proper, the Archak however, receiving no regular pay, and solicited orders on the main point at issue – viz, whether Bellamma should be allowed to have the whole Pooja of the temple till the expiry of the contract period of five years as alleged by her or should be ordered to give up at once to Venkata Krishniah his turn of Pooja.

5. In reply to the above, the District Muzrai officer, observed* among other things that the temple in question, being under Muzrai management, the appointment of Archaks permanent or acting should have the previous sanction of Government, and called for information on the following points: ———

* No 38 dated 23rd July 1891

* No 57 dated 18th August 1891

(i) Who was the Barawarddar for the Archakship in question.

(ii) When was the Barawarddar first entertained.

(iii) Who was the petitioner Narasammah that now claims a turn in the Pooja service.

(iv) What relationship did the petitioner's husband bear to the Barawarddar.

(v) By whose permission was he performing Pooja in the Temple.

6. At this stage of the enquiry, Bellamma presented a petition* to the District Murrau officer in which she enclosed a statement of her claims which she said had been submitted to the Amildar but was rejected by that officer. In this Statement Bellamma in direct opposition to her previous depositions made before the Amildar on the 13th July 1891, stated that she was the sole Barawarddar to the Archakship of the Veerangere Anjaneyaswamy temple, that she being a woman had nominated her son-in-law

* September 1891.

on Puttusamiah to perform the Pooja services that the deceased Chicka Venkatiah (father of Venkata Krishniah referred to above) had only during his life time occasionally acted in the office like some other Gumastas appointed by her whenever the said Puttusamiah was unable to attend to the Pooja work himself, and on those occasions drawn the Jaadik allowances direct from the Taluk Kutchery and that apart from this the said deceased Chicka Venkatiah had by himself possessed no manner of right for the Archakship in question. She (Bettamma) therefore requested that the Archakship held by her might be registered in the name of her adopted son Venkatasheshiah (a minor) and the Pooja services allowed to be performed by her son-in-law Puttusamiah during the minority of the said Venkata-Seshia.

7. The above petition of Bettamma together with the

enclosed statement was

No 81 dated 18th Sepr 1891. forwarded* by the District Murrai officer to the Amildar for report in Continuation of the former's Nº 57 dated 1st August 1891.

8. Meanwhile Venkata Krishniah also presented another

Dated 28th August 1891. petition* to the Amildar setting forth how he was a Hukdar too, for the Archakship in question.

9. Thereupon the Amildar

Nº 72 dated 5th Novr 1891. submitted another report* to the District Murrai officer, in which he stated that the records shewed that the Jasdik of Rs 4·5 6 endowed to the temple was being paid to Bettamma and Chika Venkatia during their respective turns, that it was evident from the depositions given, that both these persons were Hukdars for the Archakship, each having a right to do duty for six months in the year, that there was no dispute as to the above point, that Navisamma and Venkata Krishniah were descendants of the original holder of the office in the female line and Bettamma in the male line, that when Chika Venkatiah died there being no qualified

persons to perform the service Bettamma was asked to arrange for the same, that under the above circumstances there appeared no reason why the Pooja should be allowed to remain in the hands of Bettamma for five years and that it was desirable to admit both Bettamma and Venkatakrishniah as Archaks of the temple and allow them to perform the Pooja according to their respective turns.

10. On receipt of the above the District Muzrai officer called for further information on the following points :—

i In whose name did the Baraward stand prior to the entertainment of Bettamma.

ii Was Chika Venkatia then a shareholder.

No 100 dated 9th Novr '91.

11. On receipt of further report, from the Amildar the district Muzrai officer passed the following order :*

In the Baraward Register of 1876, which has been submitted, the names of Bettammah and her step-son Venkata Sanjeeviah (Since deceased) are entered; there is nothing to shew that the deceased

* No 27 dated 12th May 1892

Venkatiah, husband of the petitioner Narasammah was ever registered in the Baraward. The petitioner Narasammah has failed to produce any record or document in support of her deceased husband's right to perform Pooja in the temple; the Barwardar Bettammah urges in her statement that she, Bettammah, being a woman had appointed Venkatiah to perform the Pooja for some time and that he had accordingly been paying certain amount to her privately on that account.

"Under these circumstances it is not possible to regard the husband of the petitioner (Narsammah) as a Hakdar for the temple Archakship, and to register his heir's name jointly with that of Bettammah for the Archakship of the temple.

"If the petitioner (Narasammah) produces satisfactory evidence to prove her husband's "Hak" for the Archakship, then orders will be passed. Till then, the nominee of Bettammah should be allowed to perform

the Pooja and he should be paid the Jaradik amount. Bettammah should also be informed that in case she desires to appoint any one on her behalf other than the present man, she should obtain the orders of Government on the subject."

12. Against the above order Venkatakrishniah through his mother and guardian Naradammah appealed* to the Deputy Commissioner, who after hearing the parties passed the following order*:

"The Appellant and her witnesses refer to a plain paper Karar which has not been produced. Their statements as to its contents cannot therefore be received. The Appellant says that the Respondent fraudulently took it away from her. There is no evidence for it. however, and even if true it cannot avail her. On the other hand, the Respondents' witnesses say that the agreement

* Dated 26th October 1892

* Dated 28th December 1892

was intended to run for five years and that there was no written Karar. It is curious that each party has cited a set of witnesses who do not refer to the others.

"Under all the circumstances of the case, I can only find that the petitioner (Appellant) has failed to prove her case and that as alleged by Respondent the latter should have the Pooja for five years, paying Rs 2/8 per mensem to Appellant. The appeal is rejected."

Bellammah now appeals to this office against the above order of the Deputy Commissioner, on the following grounds:—

1. Though the Respondent failed to prove her case in the Lower Courts, still the Lower Appellate Court has erroneously directed that the Appellant should pay the Respondent a sum of Rs 2/8 per month. The Taluk authorities are wrong in deducting, every month, the sum of Rs 2/8 from the Jasdik amount

As the Temple is
under Govt management,
we will leave to pass
some order, whether it
is only a summary order,
or it is an order having
the force of a Decree. —
Post the case for hearing

LLP
24/5/94

Posted to 7th June -
Notices issued
LLP
26/5

Memo

One Venkatakrishniah (a Minor) presented a petition to the Amildar stating that his father Chick Venkatiah and Bettamma (appellant) were both Archaks of the Anjaneyaswamy temple at Veeranagere, performing Poojah by monthly turns, that his father died in Vaisaka of Vikruti (1890-91) and that he then came to an Agreement with Bettamma, the Conditions being that Bettamma should perform Poojah during Venkatakrishniah's term paying him Rs 2-8 a month and that the Agreement might be Cancelled whenever Venkata Krishniah chose to do so. He alleged in the petition that he was anxious to perform Poojah, that he asked Bettamma to allow him to do it, but in vain and prayed that he might be allowed to perform Poojah during his turns. Bettamma made a Statement first that Chick Venkatiah

Chick Venkatachi and the
had sold the right of performing
Poojah, that on his death the
Plaintiff to an Agreement with his
son C Venkatakrishniah, whereby
it was arranged that the
should perform Poojah un-
interruptedly for a period of
5 years, paying him for the
Months in which he had the
right of performing Poojah
at Rs 2- a Month. She subse-
quently made another
Statement that Chick Venkatiah
had no right to perform Poojah
and that she did not come to
any Agreement with Chick Venkatiah

The present petition
is based entirely upon an
alleged Contract between the
parties. It is not even asserted
that the Muzavaji officers had
any hand in the making of
Arrangements for the performance
of Poojah in the Anjaneyaswami
Temple.

The matter in dispute
seems to be within the Cognizance
of Civil Courts and there are a
few decisions of the Calcutta
Courts

Court supporting this view

The first Case is
Murudia vs Buvaliya &
others, reported at page 168
of the Volume of the Bombay
Law Reports. This was decided
long before the passing of the
Land Revenue Code and the point
decided was that a Suit to
establish the right to the
office of Poojari is Cognizable by
Civil Courts. The question did
not arise for decision whether
a Suit Can be sustained when
it is to establish a right to the
office of Poojari of a temple
under the Management of the
Muzorazi Dept.

Sanjeevrab & another
vs Sanjeevrab and others (Appeal
Suit 79/1890) which has not
been reported is the next Case
decided by the Chief Court. This
was a Suit for a declaration of
Plaintiffs right to perform Poojah
in a temple for 3 months in Each
year and for recovery of Dinapo
for not having been allowed

to

to perform Poojah by the Defendants.
The Chief Court decided that
as Defts performed Poojah
under the Orders of Govt as their
paid Servants, No Suit lay
against them and that Plaintiffs
Remedy Consisted in suing
the Govt. That Civil Courts
have no Jurisdiction to entertain
Suits to establish a right to
the office of Poojaris of a Muzarai
Temple has not been decided
in this Case. Sanjeevia
vs. Sanjeevia is distinguishable
from the present Case. In the
former Poojaris were appointed
by Govt, while in the latter
the Govt had nothing to do with
the appointment of a Poojari

The third Case is
Chenna Jeera vs Thimma
14 Mysore Law Reports 140.
This is a Full Bench Case and
the point decided was that
Sec 221 of the Mysore Land Revenue
Code is no bar to the institution
in a Civil Court of a Suit to
establish the right to perform
Poojah

Poojah of a temple, not under the Management of the Muzrayi Dept

There is another Case on the point, but it is not reported. It is Referred Case 4 of 93-94 (Parashurama Swamy and Another vs Chandra Sekarappa & others). In answering the reference, the Chief Judge and A. Ramachandra Iyer Esq. held that Sec 22 of the Land Revenue Code does not prohibit a Civil Court from taking Cognizance of a suit instituted to establish a right to perform the duties of Poojari of a temple, under the Management of the Muzarayi Dept. P. N. Krishna Murthy Esq did not express his opinion on the point in the Case. He said the reference was unauthorised. The reference of the Munsiff with the opinion of the Civil Court in Ref. Case 4 of 93-94 and the Judgment in O.S. 79/90 are herewith submitted



VIII



In the Chief Court of Mysore at Bangalore

Monday the 24th day of March 1890

Present

C G Plumer Esqre Chief Judge

and

T R S Thumboo Chetty Esqre, Judge

Appeal No 7 of 1890

1. Lanjeeniah
2. Krishniah } Appellants (Plaintiffs)

~~1~~

1. Lanjeeniah
2. Laniah.
3. Krishniah.
4. Sreenivasiah.
5. Ramiah. } minors by their guardian the 3rd Defendant
6. Sreenevasiah
7. Lanjeeniah

Respondents (Defendants)

Appeal against the Decree of the Munsiff of Bangalore in O.S. No 841 of 1888

This appeal coming on for hearing on Friday the 28th day of February 1890,

the

the Court delivered the following:—

Judgment

T. R. A. Thumboo Chetty Esqre, Judge:- Plaintiffs sued for a declaration of their right to make "puja" in Anjenya temple at Devarkoodahalli Bangalore Taluq, for 3 months in each year and to recover from Defendants Rs 20 as damages, on the ground that Defendants refused to allow Plaintiffs to make the pooja in April 1888, when it was their turn to do so.

2. The Munsiff dismissed the suit. He held that the temple was a Sircar temple under the management of the Muzrai Officers of Government, who, from time to time, appointed the Pujaries and directed by whom and in what order and for what length of time puja should be performed, and that, under the orders of the Deputy Commissioner issued in 1888, one Venkatappah & 1st Defendant have been doing during 6 months in year

year. The Munsiff was of opinion that Civil Courts could not interfere with the arrangements made by Government in its Muzrai Department & that the emoluments were payable to the actual officiators and could not therefore be claimed by Plaintiffs.

3. Plaintiffs, in this appeal, chiefly contended, that the temple was not a Government temple and that the Deputy Commissioner acted ultra vires in excluding Plaintiffs from the worship.

4. It was admitted by Plaintiffs' 2nd witness that this was a Sivaar temple. It admittedly enjoys a Sivaar Saddak. It is kept in repair by Government, and the evidence of Defendants' witnesses and the exhibits filed by both parties clearly prove, that the temple belongs to the Sivaas that it is under the management of the Muzrai Department and that, from time to time, punjai was performed only by those Archigs or Pujaries

who

who were recognized by the Muzgarai officers of Government and permitted to make puja. The Isadik allowance was also paid to those Pujaries, who did the service in the temple under the orders of the Muzgrai officer. It, therefore, seems to me, as found by the Munsiff, that Plaintiffs have no cause of action against Defendants. The Defendants merely perform the puja as servants appointed or recognized by Government. The temple being Sircar temple, the Muzgrai officer, on behalf of Government, has a right to regulate the worship in the temple and to appoint and dismiss the servants of the temple pujaries included. The Civil Court to cannot interfere with the internal management of the temple. If Plaintiffs have any cause of action at all, it is against the Deputy commissioner or Government, who have abstained from compelling the pujaries to perform the puja; and

and ~~they~~ sustained any damage at all, ~~or is by reason~~ of the refusal of Government to allow Plaintiffs to do service in the temple. The Defendants are merely the paid servants of Government For the service they are required to perform by Government, the "tasdik" is paid to them, and in addition thereto the Defendants, while officiating as pujaries, receive the voluntary offerings of the votaries. Such gratuitous fees are not appurtenant to the office. The votaries are at liberty to abstain from making their offerings if they do not recognize Defendants as their pujaries. As Defendants are rendering service simply under the orders of Government, it cannot be said they have deprived Plaintiffs of their office or usurped their emoluments. In this view, I think, Plaintiffs ~~not maintainable~~ and

and has been properly dismissed I would dismiss this appeal with costs.

(Signed) S.R.A. Thumbadoo Chetty
Judge

The Chief Judge. — I concur.

(Signed) C. G. Plumer
Chief Judge

"True Copy"

A Beukman
for Registrar

Copy applied for 2/10/90
" ready for delivery 17-10-90 A.B.
" delivered to Sanjeevidh.

A Beukman
for Registrar

No of words 668

Amount 0—10—6

Examining fee 0—2—4

Paper cost 0—0—6

0—13—4

Rec'd 1 / /

I. A. Thesayan Pillai

Ld. Copyist.

Examined by C. Venkat.

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Present
A. Rungaraj Ayengar
B. A. B. L. Esquire

1892-93
No. 33

(Deputy Commissioner)

Appellant
Venket Krishniya
Minor Pardhan
Mother Narsamma
widow of Venkatappa
Anjaneya Temple
Mysore Town

Respondent
Bettana
Brahmachar
of Pooja Service
of this temple

This is an appeal against order
No 27 dated 12th May/92 issued by the
Menigar officer Mysore District refusing
to Register the appellant name as pooja-
poojari of the temple and allow him to do
Pooja.

Grounds of Appeal

also had admitted

the Surgeon on her deposition given before the

of the Lord

on the Commissioner

of Respondent

to the charge of the

of the appellant

which time he could attain

appellant and her witness refer

not been produced Their Statements as to its contents cannot therefore be received. The appellant says that the Respondent fraudulently took it away from her There is no evidence for it however and even if true it cannot avail her on the hand, the Respondents witnesses say that the appellant had entered to run for 5 years and that there was no bottom kuruv.

It is curious that each party has cited a set of witnesses who do not agree to the others.

Under all the circumstances of this case I can only find that the petitioner (appellant) has failed to prove her case and as alleged by Respondent the latter should have the Pooja for 5 years paying 2½ Rs to appellant

The appeal is Rejected

23-3-93

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Present A Rungasami Iyengar
B.A.B.L. Esquire
Deputy Commissioner

Appellant
Venket Kristnuya
Minor guardian
Mother Kursumma
widow of Venkatappa
Poojari of Veeranajere
Anjanayas temple
Mysore Town

Respondent
Bettama
Barawardar
of Poojari Service
of this temple

This is and appeal against order No 27 dated 12th May/92 issued by the Menigai officer Mysore District Refusing to register the appellant name as Joint poojari of the temple and allow him t for

Grounds of Appeal

That he and the Respondent are agnates

2 That the deceased father of the appellant Venkatappa was accordingly doing the duties and receiving the emaluments attached to it by turns

3 That the above facts will be proved if the amildars report mad to the Mangroy office, and the Taluk Barawards begning from 1870 are perused — .

4 That the Respondent also had admitted the said fact in her deposition given before the amildar On 13-7-91

That when the appellants father died he was a minor and hence some Punchayet dars made an arrangement that the Respondent herself should arrange the Discharge of the duties during the of the appellant for 5 years,

Order

The appellant and her witnesses refer to a plain paper Karar which has not been produced, Their Statements as to its Contents cannot therefore be received

The appellant says that the Respondents fraudulently took it away from her, There is no evidence for it however and even if true, it cannot avail her on the land, the Respondents witnesses say that the agreements was intended to run for 5 years and that there was no written Karar.

It is curious that each party has cited a set of witnesses who do not refer to the others. — — — — — —

Under all the circumstances of this case, I can only find that the petitioner (appellant) has failed to prove her case and as alleged by Respondent, latter should have the Pooja for

yung 2½ Rs per sem to appellant—

The appeal is rejected

(Signed A. Rungasami Iyengar

Deputy Commissioner

Copy applied 18th January 93

Copy ready 23rd March 93

Copy Delivered

నంబరు
20

నకలు

[illegible]

[illegible]

నకలు

ಸಂಪ್ಲಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ

ಹೊಸಪೇಟೆ

ಸಂಪ್ಲಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೭೫/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಮತ್ತು ೪೨೦ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಆರೋಪಿತರ ಪತ್ತೆ ಕಾರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪ್ಲಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಪಿಎಸ್‌ಐ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರು ಹಾಗೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಪಿಎಸ್‌ಐ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಬಸ್ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರ ಪತ್ತೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಖಚಿತ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಆರೋಪಿತರಾದ ೧) ಕೆ. ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ತಂದೆ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ, ೨೫ ವರ್ಷ, ಕುರುಬರ ಜನಾಂಗ, ಕೂಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ, ವಾಸ ಕೆ. ಹೊಸಹಳ್ಳಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಮತ್ತು ೨) ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ತಂದೆ ಕೆ. ಕೊಟ್ರಪ್ಪ, ೫೫ ವರ್ಷ, ಕುರುಬರ ಜನಾಂಗ, ಕೂಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ, ವಾಸ ಕೆ. ಹೊಸಹಳ್ಳಿ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಇವರುಗಳನ್ನು ಪತ್ತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳುವಾಗಿದ್ದ ಒಟ್ಟು ೧೦ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಮೌಲ್ಯ ಸುಮಾರು ೩,೫೦,೦೦೦/- ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳು ಕಳ್ಳತನವಾಗಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೭ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳು ಸಂಪ್ಲಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೭೫/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಮತ್ತು ೪೨೦ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೩ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳು ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೭೫/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೭೬/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೭೭/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೭೮/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೭೯/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೦/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೧/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೨/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೩/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೪/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೫/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೬/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೭/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೮/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೮೯/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೦/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೧/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೨/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೩/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೪/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೫/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೬/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೭/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೮/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೧೯೯/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೦/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೧/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೨/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೩/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೪/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೫/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೬/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೭/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೮/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೦೯/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೦/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೧/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೨/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೩/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೪/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೫/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೬/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೭/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೮/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೧೯/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೨೦/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯ ಐಪಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿತರಿಂದ ಜಪ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್‌ಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ೦೧ ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಸೈಕಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟೂರು ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಯ ಗುನ್ನೆ ನಂ ೨೨೧/೨೦೧೭ ಕಲಂ ೩೭೯

To

The Deputy Comm^r.

Mysore

Dated

Despd. 14 [redacted] 93

Encl. 1

R^e $\frac{20734}{\text{Pet } 1619}$

Has the honor to observe that the date of the D^y Com^r order in Mis. Rev. appeal No 33 of 1892-93 (Venkatkrishn & Bettamma) is not entered in the enclosed authenticated copy of the order produced by Bettamma with her second appeal, and to request that the omission may be supplied and a copy returned.

P. Bangalore.—30-1-93.—5,000.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893 . 15-216.

From Pet 616
The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Dated

Despatched 21st June 1893

Received

Enclosures No. One

General No.

No. 1492.

Resubmitting as desired the copy of order in Revenue Miscellaneous case No. 33 of 1892-93 on the file of this court with the date of the order duly entered therein

Petitioner.
Mrn
23/6

Copy of Judgment to be put up with the appeal petition, which is to be sent to the Inzerai Department. The papers are to be sent to the Inzerai Supte with a docket
23/6

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—30-1-93.—5,000.

No 1492.
Ex. I.

Mysore Dy Commrs Office
Dated Allpore 21st June 1893.

From

A. Rangasami Iyengar Esquire
Dy Asst Commissioner

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Govt of Allpore

Sir,

I have the honor to resubmit the copy of order in Revenue Miss: Case No 33 of 1892-93 on the file of this Court with the date of the order duly entered therein, as desired in your docket No 20734/1619 dated 10th June 1893.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedt Servant

A Rangasami
Dy Asst Commissioner
Allpore District

Compd.
Ex.

-No 4041/2801

In the Chief Court of Mysore, at Bangalore.

Friday the 9th day of February 1894.

Present

Rajah Dharma Pravina I.R.A. Ilumboo Chetty Esq.

Chief Judge

A. Ramachandra Iyer Esquire, Judge.

and

V. Krishna Murti Esquire, Judge.

Second Appeal admitted

Referred Case No: 4 of 1893-94, from the Munsiff of Nanjungood, in O.S. No: 984 of 1892.

1 Ramsha Rama Shastry
2. Rama Krishna Shastry } — Plaintiffs

vs

1 Chandra Shakera Shastry
2. Rama Shastry
3. Ganapathy Shastry
4. Krishna Shastry } Defendants

This case coming on for hearing on Friday the 2d day of February 1894: Upon perusing the case as stated by the Munsiff of Nanjungood, the Court pronounced the following

Opinion

The Chief Judge:— I am of opinion that this

No 4041
2801

In the Chief Court of Mysore, at Bangalore.
Friday the 9th day of February 1894.

Present

Rajah Dharma Prawina I.R.A. Thumboo Chetty Esqr.
Chief Judge
A. Ramachandra Iyer Esquire, Judge.
and
P. N. Krishna Murti Esquire, Judge.

Record Received & Entered

Referred Case No: 4 of 1893-94, from the Munsiff of Nanjungood, in O.S. No: 984 of 1892.

1 Ramsha Rama Shastry
2. Rama Krishna Shastry } — Plaintiffs

vs

1 Chandra Shakera Shastry
2. Rama Shastry
3. Ganapathy Shastry
4. Krishna Shastry } Defendants

This case coming on for hearing on Friday the 2d day of February 1894: Upon perusing the case as stated by the Munsiff of Nanjungood, the Court pronounced the following

Opinion

The Chief Judge:— I am of opinion that this

-this reference was unnecessary, if not unauthorized under Section 227 of the Mysore Land Revenue Code. That Code, as its Preamble sets forth consolidated and amended the law relating to Revenue Officers and to the assessment and recovery of Land Revenue and to other matters connected with the Land Revenue Administration. The hereditary offices and duties and the village officers and servants, referred to in Section 221, are those appertaining to the Land Revenue Administration of Mysore. The Code has nothing whatever to do with Inigrai Establishments or allowances or Endowments attached to Temples or the rights appertaining to performance of puja or other worship connected with such temples, or the participation of profits perquisites or allowances by Pujaris, or hereditary or other servants of the said Temples. The Plaintiffs sued to establish their right to render by turns certain services in the temple at Mungungud, and to recover from Defendants one fourth of the monthly salary and daily rice doles from Defendants. The provisions of section 221, of the Land Revenue Code, are clearly no bar

to

to the institution of this suit. This is purely a suit of a civil nature which is cognizable by Civil Courts, under section 11, Civil Procedure Code. The decision of this Court quoted by the Munsiff — 14 Mysore Law Reports page 150 — is more an authority in favor of the suit being within the cognizance of a Civil Court than otherwise. I would return the record to the Munsiff with the above remarks. I wish, however, to add, that if the money allowance &c, which Defendants receive from Government Muzrai Officers comes within the Pension Act XXIII of 1861, definition given in section 3, section 4 debars Civil Courts from taking cognizance of the suit without a Certificate from the Collector (Deputy Commissioner) or other authorized Officer. This, however, is a point which has neither been raised nor discussed by the Munsiff or argued before us.

C. Thumboo Chetty

Chief Judge

A. Ramachandra Iyer Esqr: — This was a suit to establish the plaintiffs' right to a

ditary

hereditary office in the temple at Nanjun-
gode and to recover the arrears of pay from
the defendants, who are the plaintiffs' co-
parceners. It was admitted that the tem-
ple is managed by the Inungarai De-
partment. The point which has been
referred by the Munsiff is whether section
221 of the Land Revenue Code, is a bar
to the cognizance of the suit.

I agree in the opinion of the
learned Chief Judge, that the matter in
dispute is not within the purview of
the Land Revenue Code. For the reasons
which I have stated in my Judgment
in Suit: appeal 36 of 1892 I hold that the
hereditary officer or servant referred to
in section 221 is an officer or servant
appointed or recognized by Government
as the chief controlling authority in all
matters relating to the Land Revenue.
The Munsiff has power to entertain the
suit. Whether the plaint is defective,
and whether the suit is maintainable
on other grounds, are questions which
do not arise out of this reference,
and I must abstain from expressing

my

my opinion thereon.

A Ramachandra Iyer

Judge

P. N. Krishna Murti Esqr:— I have not much to add. The provisions of the Land Revenue Code do not apply to the class of servants disputing their so-called title to the office in question in this suit. The reference is, therefore, unauthorized by that Code, and I do not feel bound to answer the question referred.

Williams Innes Smith

Judge

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

2949.

The accompanying Petition No. ~~3297~~

dated 19th June 1893 received at the

Dewan's Office from Bettamma, Baravarda of the Anjaneyaswami temple, Hanagere, Mysore Taluk, praying that the date fixed for hearing the appeal presented by her against the Mysore Deputy Commissioner's order in Revt appeal case No. 33 of 1892-93 may be intimated to her.

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~

the Inungrai Superintendent with the papers noted below, for disposal and endorsement to Petitioner, as the Petitioner has presented an appeal against the same order to the Inungrai Superintendent:-

(1) Appeal Petition No: presented to this office 9th May 1893, with copy of the order appealed against & other enclosures

(2) Petition No 3234 / Camp 324 dated 23 May 1893.

2. The Petition presented to the Inungrai Superintendent which had been sent to this office for reference is herewith returned.

By Order,

Draft.

BANGALORE, 9 June 1893.

for Chief Secretary.

Bangaloro.—21-11-92—3,000.

This is an appeal from an order passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore in case relating to a hereditary vyavaraji appointment (Pujari)

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 2947

Name of Petitioner. Bettamma Baravardar of Poojari service of Vyavaraji agrahara Jayalakshmipuram temple

Village. Mysore

Taluk. Do

District. Do

Date of Arzi. 9-5-93

Date of Receipt. 9-5-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. five.

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the order of the Deputy Commissioner in his Revenue Appeal case no: 33 of 1892-93, ~~for~~ & on the order thereon to the Amildar, for the following reasons:—

1) that the Lower Appellate Court erred in ordering the Resp to pay monthy 2½ Rs to the Appellant Narasamma, to ~~mom~~ Venkatkrishnia Chetty.

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

... as there were no evidences forthcoming on the side of the Appellant.

(2) that the Taluk authorities were wrong in ~~doing~~ deducting, 2½ Rs in the last April, from the 15 "hanas" (Rs 4-5-6) which the Respondent used to get every month & in disbursing the same to the Appellant.

(3) that the amount 15 hanas were given to Respondent not for her own use but for Gods & therefore the lower Court had no right to split it.

(4) that the late Maharajah has given a sannad, dt 5-7-1813, sta that the amount should be spent for the procession etc only, the copy of the sannad is herein enclosed & the original is with the Appellant

(5) that there is an error in not giving 2 varahas to the temple according to the wordings of the sannad.

(6) that if 2½ Rs be deducted from 15 hanas, the remainder will be insufficient to maintain the ceremonies to be observed annually.

The petitioner therefore begs that the order of the Lower Court ordering the Respondent to pay 2½ Rs per mensem the [illegible] be cancelled.

Rupees Stamped of Court-fee

29-6-94

[illegible] 29-6-94

[illegible]

[illegible] 1893 [illegible] Second Appeal Case no,

[illegible]	[illegible] —	[illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]	వాది —	అప్పీలంటు.

[illegible] 1892-93 [illegible] 33 [illegible] —————

[illegible] 2 ½ [illegible] —————

2 [illegible] April [illegible] 15 [illegible] (4-5-6) 2 ½ [illegible] ——.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 324/3234

Name of Petitioner. Bettamma

Baravardar of the Anjaneya

Village. Swami temple

Yeranagere

Taluk. Mysore

District. Mysore –

Date of Arzi. 29.5.93.

Date of Receipt. 31.5.93.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. — nil —

ABSTRACT.

Reminder to Appl.
petition dated
against the order of the
-puty Commissioner, Mys
Dis^t in Rev: Mis: Case No
of 1892-93 regarding the
-ment of the "Thasthik" of the
Anjaneyaswami temple at
Yeranagere.

1 Papers
2 This is a subject
to be transferred
to the Revenue Secy
Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000



Appellant

Respondent

(Application of Appellant)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

4

5

6

7

8

9

20-5-92



MYSORE DEWAN'S C.
PETITION DEPARTMENT
CAMP Mysore
REG'D NO 324
DATE 3/6/93.

3234 of
7-6-93

29-5-93

ప్రియమైన స్నేహితుడికి —

మనం ఎంతో ఇష్టంగా — ఆత్మీయంగా — కలిసి చదువుకున్న రోజులు ఎంత బాగుండేవి! ఆ రోజులు మళ్ళీ రావు కదూ! ఎప్పుడైనా ఆ రోజులు గుర్తుకు వచ్చినప్పుడు నీకు నా జ్ఞాపకం వస్తుందా? నీ జ్ఞాపకాలలో నేను ఎక్కడ ఉన్నాను? నీ మనసులో నాకు ఎంత స్థానం ఉంది? ఇలాంటి ప్రశ్నలు ఎన్నో నా మనసులో మెదులుతున్నాయి.

ఇంటర్ పరీక్షలు అయిపోయిన తరువాత మనం ఎవరి దారిన వారు వెళ్ళిపోయాం. ఎవరి ఊళ్ళకు వారు వెళ్ళిపోయాం. ఎవరి పనులలో వారు మునిగిపోయాం. ఎవరి జీవితాలలో వారు బిజీ అయిపోయారు. ఎవరి ఆలోచనలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ప్రపంచంలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి కుటుంబాలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ఉద్యోగాలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి వ్యాపారాలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి వ్యవసాయాలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ఇళ్ళలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి పిల్లలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి భార్యలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి భర్తలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి తల్లిదండ్రులలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి అత్తమామలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి అల్లుళ్ళలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి కోడళ్ళలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి మనవళ్ళలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి మనవరాళ్ళలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ముని మనవళ్ళలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ముని మనవరాళ్ళలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ఆస్తులలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి అప్పులలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి కష్టాలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి సుఖాలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి బాధలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ఆనందాలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ఏడుపులలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి నవ్వులలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ఆలోచనలలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి ప్రపంచంలో వారు ఉన్నారు. ఎవరి జీవితాలలో వారు బిజీ అయిపోయారు. ఎవరి పనులలో వారు మునిగిపోయారు. ఎవరి జ్ఞాపకాలలో నేను ఎక్కడ ఉన్నాను? నీ మనసులో నాకు ఎంత స్థానం ఉంది? ఇలాంటి ప్రశ్నలు ఎన్నో నా మనసులో మెదులుతున్నాయి.

ఆత్మీయ స్నేహితుడు,
ఎం. ఎస్. లోకేశ్వర్

ఇట్లు
నీ ప్రియమైన స్నేహితుడు
ఎం. ఎస్. లోకేశ్వర్

(General Serial No. 32.)

189

P. No. 3234 of 92 sent to Muzarai Dept. on 17/6/93

26/6/93

No. 3297

Name of Petitioner. Bethamma

Baravardar of Anjaneya temple

Village. Ramagere

Taluk.

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi.

Date of Receipt. 19-6-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. nil.

After satisfying myself the appeal was in time, I intended to submit a memorandum representing that the appeal lay to the Muzarai Superintendent and that it might be summoned for presentation to that Office.

The papers put up show that Petitioner has presented a separate appeal petition Ore 117 to the Muzarai Superintendent and that that Office has called for reference in this Office.

The Petitioner may be sent to the Muzarai Superintendent & Petitioner informed accordingly.

27/6

ABSTRACT.

Prays that she may be informed of the date of hearing of her Appeal.

19/6.

Muzarai Branch.

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92.—1000.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

P. No. 3236 of 92 sent to Muzarai Dept. on 17/6/93

[illegible] 26/6/93

No. 3297

Name of Petitioner. Bettamma

Barawardar of Anjaneya temple

Village. Iranayeri

Taluk.

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 19-6-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. nil.

ABSTRACT.

Prays that she may be informed of the date of hearing of her Appeal.

After satisfying myself as to the appeal was in time, I intended to submit a memorandum representing that the appeal lay to the Muzarai Superintendent and that it might be returned for presentation to that Office.

The papers put up show that Petitioner has presented a separate appeal petition on 17/6 to the Muzarai Superintendent and that that Office has called for references in this office.

The Petitioner may be sent to the Muzarai Superintendent & Petitioner informed accordingly.

V 27/6

19/6.

Muzarai Branch.

[illegible]

Mysore Govt. Central Press Banga

19-6-93 3297 R

M/

159

28/7/93

(Appellant)

Respondent

Appellant

Appellant

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 310

Name of Petitioner. Bethamma

Village. ~~Vasana~~

Taluk. Mysore

District.

Date of Appl.

Date of Receipt. 31 July 93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

States that by 3:
- the past life applic
in this office - date
and may not sen
be her as yet. where she requ
that she may be made know
as to the hearing date be.

to.
3/8

Cancelled

Early

31/7

5101

31-7-93

Appeal Case No.

Appellant

Respondent

Application of Appellant

"

"

1

2

3

4

300

93

In the Year 1893 Civil S. A. No.

Appellant

Respondent

Application of Appellant

a

b

c

d

28-8-93

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 :

No. 377.

Name of Petitioner. Bettamma

Village.

Taluk. Nagar

District.

Date of Arzi. 7 — 8 — 93.

Date of Receipt. 7 — 8 — 93.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

With reference to her appeal
x Application dated 9/5 to this Office, with 8 or 8 copies of the Local authorities, regarding the claim of her Pujarish of an Anjinaya Swami temple, of Nalur that the Mysore Sub-Dt ordered her for production of the order copies of the Local authorities, on an other petition presented by herself for an enquiry to him of the

Therefore the
request of the above Copies
which are in this Office
returned to her or may be
may be transferred to
the Museum Sept 10, having
given an information
Endorsement to her, to
that effect.

Meshawaka
9/8/93

Mysore Court Fee

EIGHT ANNAS

377 R
7-8-93

Application of Appellant

Appellant and Respondent

Respondent and Appellant

Second Appeal

Rupees 140

as 7/1883

Second Appeal No. of 1893

Appellant (Respondent)

Respondent) Appellant

2

3.

4.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಸದಾಶಿವಯ್ಯ, ಬಿ.ಎ., ಬಿ.ಎಲ್.,
ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಮತ್ತು ಜೆ.ಎಂ.ಎಫ್.ಸಿ.,
ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು.

ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 12/1964

ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿದಾರರು — ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಟಿ. ಸಿ. ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ಘಟಕದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾಪಕರು.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ — ಶ್ರೀ ಸಾಲೆಕೊಪ್ಪ ಶಿವಪ್ಪ ಮಗ ಸಾಲೆಕೊಪ್ಪ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ, ಪ್ರಾಯ 21½ ವರ್ಷ, ಕೃಷಿಕರು, ಸಾಲೆಕೊಪ್ಪ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು.

ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿದಾರರ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು — ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಬಿ.ಎ., ಬಿ.ಎಲ್.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು — ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಆರ್. ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ, ಬಿ.ಎ., ಎಲ್.ಎಲ್.ಬಿ.

ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನಡೆದ ದಿನಾಂಕ — 14-7-1964

ತೀರ್ಪು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ — 28-7-1964

ಆಜ್ಞಾಪಕ ಪತ್ರ

ಈ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯು ಮೋಟಾರು ವಾಹನಗಳ ಅಪಘಾತ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೋರಿ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿದಾರರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ತೀರ್ಪಿನ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿದಾರರ ಬಸ್ಸಿನ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಿಲುಕಿ ಗಾಯಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾನೆಂಬ ಆರೋಪಣೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವನು ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗಿ ರೂ. 7500/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದನು. ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿದಾರರು ಆರೋಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಮತ್ತು ಜೆ.ಎಂ.ಎಫ್.ಸಿ., ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ಇವರು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗೆ ರೂ. 2500/- ಗಳ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಪು ನೀಡಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ತೀರ್ಪಿನ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿದಾರರು ಈ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿದಾರರ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು ಪರಿಹಾರದ ಮೊತ್ತವು ಅತಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿದರು. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು ಪರಿಹಾರದ ಮೊತ್ತವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿದರು.

ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಈ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯವು ಪರಿಹಾರದ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ರೂ. 1500/- ಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಭಾಗಶಃ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿ ಆಜ್ಞಾಪಕ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದೆ.

ಆಜ್ಞಾಪಕ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಇಂದು ಬಹಿರಂಗ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಘೋಷಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

ಸಹಿ/-
ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಮತ್ತು ಜೆ.ಎಂ.ಎಫ್.ಸಿ.,
ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು.

M. No. 434 R

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. ~~Ho~~ appeal 2949

dated ~~the August~~ 9th May 1893 received at the

Dewan's Office from Bettamma,

Pujari Banasavaddar of

the Veeranagere Anjaneya

Temple, Mysore

is forwarded, together with its ~~No~~ 5

enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District, for submission

of the entire records

connected with the case.

By Order,

Dft- [signature]

Muzrai Secretary.

Mysore
~~BANGALORE~~,
27-10-1893

Jon

23-12-93

444

8.11.93

1893 :

From

The Muzrai Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Dy. Commr
Mysore District

Dated 23rd.

Despatched 24 December.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No 688
M. No.

Office memo

This Office No. 434 dated 6 October 1893 forwarding appeal petition no 2949 dy 9th may 1893 from Bettamma Pujari Baravarddaru of the Veranagere Anjaneya temple Mysore, for submission of the entire records connected with ~~and subsequent reminder marginally noted~~ the case.

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request ~~an early reply~~ the submission of the records at an early date.

"By Order"

Muzrai-Secretary.

From the same no 4978 18.1.94

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894.

OFFICE OF THE 212 MUZRAI BRANCH

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.
Moozrai Department

Dated

Despatched 18th January 1894

Received 22-1-94

Enclosures No. Records and Petition No. 2949 with 5 enclosures

General No.

No. 797

Submitting as directed the entire records connected with this court Miscellaneous Revenue appeal No. 33 of 1892-93.

Vide No. 2301 / P. 2099 of 17/6/94

No. 797.
Ea. Records &
Petition No. 2949
with 5 enclosures.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore 18th January 1894.

From A. Rungasawmi Iyengar Esqre

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore,
Inuzri Department

SIR,

I have the honor to submit herewith the entire records connected with this Court Miscellaneous Revenue appeal No 33 of 1892-93 as directed in your O. M. No 4584 dated 30 October 1893

The appeal petition and enclosures received with the above are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Asst
Dy Commissioner
Mysore

Compared
ady.

OFFICE THE
MUZRAI BRANCH
DEWAN OF MYSORE

Petn
no 1584.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

No. 257

Name of Petitioner. Bettaiamma w/o Thimmanna aliascc.

Village.

Taluk. Bangalore

District.

Date of Arri. 28-2-94

Date of Receipt. 1-3-94

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosures: Nil

To The Secretary Inquiries Dept
for disposal

By order
for Chief Secretary.

1/3/94

Applies for an unauthenticated copy of the official petition given by her & of the petition of her Respondent, if any.

5/3.

Code 2301/91



2581 (2)
1-3-94

Memorandum
Enclosure Rel

Grant
25/4/94

The Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Mejrai Appeal No. of 93 94.

Respondent

Appellant.
Bettamma. } vs } Venkatakrishnia minor by
guardian Narasamma.

The appellant above named respectfully
prays that she will be furnished with copies of
the appeal petition in the above case and
of the petition, if any, given by the Respondent
to the Government in connection with the
appeal.

24th February
1894

B. Subbanna
Advocate for appellant

Received Copy. of the appeal petition.

B. C. Tennisami

Clerk. Mr= B. Subbarao

Advocate.

Ootr.



ಕೋರ್ಟ್

ಸ್ ನೇ 1893-94ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನಂಬರ್

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ಮಿಸ್ಟರ್, ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್, ಬಿ. ಸುಬ್ಬಣ್ಣ, ಬಿ- ಯೆ- ಬಿ ಯಲ್, ರವರಿಗೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಯುತರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಿವಾದಿಸಿಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗು, ಮತ್ತು ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕಡಿಕರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೆ ಲವಜು ವಗೈರೆ ತೆಗದುಕ್ಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹಾ ತಮಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನನಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 25ನೇ january
ಸ್ 1894ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ರುಜು.

ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೇ.

B. Subbanna
adv.

ಈಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರು, ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ತುಲಸೀಪ್ಪೇಟೆದಲ್ಲಿರುವ, ರಾಘವಾಚಾರ್ರಿಗಾಗಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಬುಕ್‌ಡಿಪೊಪ್ರಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮುದ್ರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿತು 1893.

Accepted

Authorised

(General Sc al No. 30)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
MUZARAI BRANCH
8/14
189

From
Chief
The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore

To
The Muzrai Superintendent

Dated 17th June 1894
Despatched 2 July 1894
Received 2/7/

Enclosures No.

General No. 2 3011
~~Muzarai. F. No~~ P 2099

Forwarding copy of Appeal Decision No 2949 of 1892-3 re. the Pujari allowance in the Anjenayaswami temple in Mysore

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—12-1-93.—1,000.

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 2949 of 1892-93

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Bettamma of Mysore represented by M. D. Narasingar advocate

Venkatakrishnaiá minor by his mother and Guardian Narasamma

Decision.

Appellant is Pujari in the temple of Anjaneyaswami in Mysore, and is in enjoyment of an allowance of Rs 4-5-6 from Government for Paditaram expenses. In 1891, Respondent claimed a moiety of the Pujari hak, and the Appellant admitted his right and stated that it was time that both herself and Respondent's father were doing duties by turns, each a month, but that on the death of Respondent's father in Vikriti 1890-91, the Respondent's mother and herself entered into an agreement under which she was to hold the Office for 5 years paying Respondent Rs 2-8-0 per mensem and insisted upon the agreement being carried out. Although there was no documentary evidence to prove the alleged agreement, the Deputy Commissioner decided that the private agreement shall be carried out and

accordingly a sum of Rs 2-8 - out of the allowance is being paid to Respondent.

2. Appellant now denies the hak of the Respondent altogether, and states that any payment to the Respondent out of the Padiyaram allowance is illegal, and inconsistent with the object of the grant

3. Appellant having once admitted the right of the Respondent, she cannot be now allowed to deny it The Amildar's report shows that when Respondent's father was alive, he was doing duties by turns and receiving the allowance during his turn. The Government are therefore of opinion that unless the appellant is willing to act up to the agreement, Respondent should be allowed to do duties by turns, as his father used to do, and the Deputy Commissioner is requested to revise his order accordingly. It may be inconvenient to allow the Appellant and Respondent to do duties each a month. If so, the Deputy Commissioner is authorized to direct that they perform duties each for six months or a year

By Order
(Sd) T Ananda Rao
Chief Secretary

No 23011 / P. 2099. Dy 17-6-94 / 2/7.

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner Mysore District returning the records received with his letter dy 18th January 1894.

Copy forwarded to the Muzrai Superintendent for information

By Order

T Ananda Rao
for Chief Secretary

dfd 20 [illegible]

No 2949 Dated 17th June 1894

29

~~No 2859~~

29-6-94

Endorsement granted to Bettamma of Mysore, in reply to her petition No 2949 dated 9th May 1893, appealing against the decision of the Deputy-Commissioner of Mysore in his appeal No 33 of 1892-93, regarding the office of Pujari of the Anjaney ~~asswamy~~ temple Virangere at Mysore.

Appellant is informed that her appeal has been dismissed, and that the Deputy-Commissioner has been requested to allow Respondent to do duties by turns, if appellant is not willing to abide by the decision already passed by him.

2.

2. The enclosures are herewith returned.

By Order

Draft Council order

22/6/94

Chief Secretary.



Petition No 2949 of 1892-93

Appellant-
Bettamma of
Mysore
represented by
Mr M. D. Narasimgar
Advocate.

Respondent.
Venkatakrishnaiya
minor by his mother
and guardian Narasamma

Decision

Appellant is Pujari in the temple of Anjaneyaswami in Mysore, and is in enjoyment of an allowance of Rs 4-5-6 from Government for Paditaram expenses. In 1891, Respondent claimed a moiety of the Pujari Hak, and the appellant admitted his right and stated that it was true that both herself and Respondent's father were doing duties by turns, each a month, but that on the death of Respondent's

father in Vikriti 1890-91, the Respondent's mother and herself entered into an agreement under which she was to hold the office for 5 years paying Respondent Rs 2-8-0 per mensem, and insisted upon the agreement being carried out. Although there was no documentary evidence to prove the alleged agreement, the Deputy Commissioner decided that the private agreement shall be carried out, and accordingly, a sum of Rs 2-8-0 out of the allowance is being paid to Respondent.

2. Appellant now denies the right of the Respondent altogether, and states that any payment to the Respondent out of the Padikaram allowance is illegal, and inconsistent with the object of the grant.

3. Appellant having once admitted the right of

the Respondent, she cannot be now allowed to deny it. The Amildar's report shows that when Respondent's father was alive he was doing duties by turns and receiving the allowance during his turn. The Government are therefore of opinion that unless the Appellant is willing to act up to the agreement, Respondent should be allowed to do duties by his turns as his father used to do, and the Deputy Commissioner is requested to revise his order accordingly. It may be inconvenient to allow the Appellant and Respondent to do duties each a month. If so, the Deputy Commissioner is authorized to direct that they ~~should~~ perform

duties each for six months or a year.

By Order

Redraft

Chief Secretary.

No 23011 / P.2099 8/17.6.94

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commr Mysore District, with the records received with his letter No 797 dated 18th January 1894.

By Order

Chief Secretary.

pr

Put in abstract

28/9/7

Let a Copy be sent to the Manager's Office for information

27/6

Petition

Please take orders for guidance whether such decisions should come from the Chief Secy's or the Commissioner's

Sd 16/6

Sub:

The Revenue Commissioner said that this order might be issued from the Chief Secretary's Office.

9/6.

M no of

Appellant
Bataamma

Respt
Venkatalakshmiah
by her mother &
guardian Narasamma

Appellant is a Pujàri in the temple of Anjaneyaswami in Mysore & is in enjoyment of an allowance of Rs 4-5-6 from Govt for Padartanam expenses. In 1891, Respt claimed a moiety of the Pujàri Hack & the appellant admitted his right, but stated that ~~on the death of Respts father~~ it was true that both he & Respts father were doing duties by turns each a month, but that on the death of Respts father in Vikruti 1890-91, the Respts mother & he ~~they~~ entered into an agreement by which he was to hold the office for 5 years paying Respt Rs 2-8-0 per

Rir. up the Proceedings of the Mes: appeal before Sr. Dy. Commr. Mysore in para 3 of the Petition

12/11

File is putup, 23011 of 17-6-94 to D.C. Mysore 13/11.

Council Case - In time Stamp sufficient Subd. with reference - 15/11 To the Mysore Secy - A 15-11-95

Recd 16/11 Drafted 18-11-95

1895

No. 1665

Name of Petitioner, Bellāmma - widow

Village, Venkatā Pujari of Anjaneya's temple at Veeranapore

Taluk,

District, Mysore

Date of Arzi,

Date of Receipt, 4-11-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 2

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the order of the Dy. Commr. Mysore District in Rev. appeal No. 3 of 1895-96 respecting the office of Pujari of the Anjaneya's temple at Veeranapore - Mysore.

The petitioner urges:-

(1) That she is the sole hakdar to the office of Pujari and that the respondent has no manner of right to it.

(2) That the Lower Appellate Court having raised the question whether the office was hereditary or not, should have enquired into it and not failed to investigate it.

(3) That respondent has not made a word in his statement in the original Court

to the effect that Narasamma was the Karnam of the Peppuchipy of the said Anjaneya swami - that he had two sons viz. Timmappa and Venkata, that they as deponents used to conduct the worship separately - that the said Timmappa had no male issue and had a daughter named Venkatamma on whom he conferred the office as gift - and that the said Venkatamma transferred the office to her husband 45 years ago. She has also produced a deed of gift executed on an unstamped paper -

that no penalty has been recovered on the said deed of gift - hence not registered. It is not written either on an old stamp paper. The lower court has admitted it - moreover the said deed has been recently attested by witnesses. Hence should be examined -

That the genealogy as traced in the said deed has not been proved - the respondent has not adduced any proof in this respect

That in the original court the first issue namely that the appellant was is the wife of Narasimhan Venkatia that the said Venkatia had a son named Venkata Sanyasia has been duly proved -

That the lower court has asked whether there was any Karar between the plaintiff and the defendants in respect of their Karnam to conduct the worship - they say that the Karar was not executed and that the Panchayatdars settled that during the death of the defendants father the plaintiff should pay to the defts 2½ per measure, but that they do not say that the plaintiff executed a Karar - the second issue has not been proved -

That it is stated that when the Dy Collr had enquiry powers the Shirastadar of the Peppur Taluk took down the deposition of the appellant, that the appellant has in case deposition neither accepted the Karnam of the respondents to conduct the worship and that the said deposition has been attested by Vallabha Sanyasi the brother of respondent Narasamma the lower court has admitted the said deposition - whether the appellant was asked she denied having given the said deposition - the admission of such a deposition by the lower court is against law - moreover it is a proceeding which took place in a court which had no jurisdiction in the matter - the lower court has taken this deposition to be a Karar - it is a mistake

That there are references in the accounts to show that the respondents ancestors Venkatia conducted the worship from 1882 to 1892 as pujaris to the appellant. The said Venkatia's name is not in all the mentions in the accounts previous to the above year the appellant is the Poojaridar Karnam and it is borne out in the last accounts

That it is clear from the Varavara, from the patta of the God produced by the appellant and from the Samad of 1813 granted by the Rajah of Peppur that she is the sole Karnam to perform the worship.

~~Pet~~ Pet 1024 Enc: 3.

20-5-95 ab-11-

~~B~~

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1665

~~dated~~ without date received at the Dewan's Office from Bettamma ~~a~~ widow of Venkatia, Pujari of Anjeneya's temple at Veeranpoor Mysore, regarding the office of Pujari of the said ~~Anjeneya~~ Swami's temple ~~temple~~,

two

enclosures, ~~t~~ any to the Government of Mysore, Huzoor Department

BANGALORE, 23-11-1895

Revenue Secretary.

26

18-11-95

"26-11-93

Pet 1024 Encl 3 438

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1665
dated without date received at the
Dewan's Office from Bettamma,
widow of Venkatia, Pujari
of Anjaneya's temple at
Veeranapoor, Mysore, regarding
the Office of Pujari of the
said temple,

forwarded, together with its two
enclosures, to the Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Muzrai Department.

Ramaswamy Ayyangar
Revenue Secretary.

BANGALORE, 23
November 1895

an Dist: No 1238 dt 4-4-96

1665 M
4-11-95

MYSORE COURT

1665 M
4-11-95

4 [illegible]

5 [illegible]

6 — [illegible]

7 [illegible]

8 [illegible]

ਸਰਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਸਮੇਂ ਸਮੇਂ ਤੇ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਹਦਾਇਤਾਂ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਟਾਫ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਕੂਲ ਦੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ।

Copy applied for by Bettamm

Copy ready 24-10-95

Copy delivered 24-10-95 N.L.G

No: of words: 3

Copying fee 4 -

Comparing fee 4 -

Paper cost 4 -



In the Court of the Deputy-Commissioner

of the Mysore District

Dated, Mysore, 17th September 1895

Present B. K. Venkatavarada Iyengar Esquire

Deputy Commissioner

Revenue Regular Appeal no: 3 of 1895-96

Appellant (Plaintiff)

Bettamma, widow of Poojari Venkatiya residing in Veeranajere in Mysore.

Respondent (Defendants)

1. Venkatā Krishniah (minor)

2. Narasamma Mother of Venkatā Krishniah, also residing in Veeranajere in Mysore.

1. This is an appeal against the order of the First Assistant Commissioner of this (Mysore) District, dated the 23rd July 1895, in Revenue Regular Suit

no.

no: 5 of 1894-95 on the file of his Court dismissing the Appellant's suit to establish that she is the sole poojaré of the Anjanéyaswamy temple at Veeranagere near Mysore and that the Respondents have no manner of title to it.

2. The grounds of Appeal are: -

(1) That it has not been proved that the Respondents have any right to the Poojarishipp; and -

(2) That the agreement referred to in the judgment of the Lower Court is opposed to law and devoid of consideration.

3. That the Elders of both parties were doing the duties of the office by turns - till their death has been admitted but the Appellant now alleges that

the

the Elders of the Respondents were only acting as gumastas. This is not reliable inasmuch as they were doing the work by turns. Further the Appellant at a previous Miscellaneous enquiry admitted the title of the Respondents to a moiety of the office and on that ground the Government before whom the matter went up in appeal on the Miscellaneous proceedings decided that the Respondents were half sharers.

4. I therefore, agree with the Lower Court in dismissing the suit of the Appellant. She should bear all the costs throughout. I have doubts if the Poojari offices are, like those of Patails and Shanbhogs, hereditory and properly form the

Sub

subject of regular suits. But in the above view of the case it is not necessary to try this point now.

17-9-95 (Signed) B. K. Venkatāvarada Iyengar

Deputy Commissioner

"Compared"
M. Venkatarao.

"Copy".
M. Krishnaiyar
Revenue Sheristadar
Mysore District

Copy applied for by Bettamma on 9-10-95
Copy ready on 9-10-95
Copy delivered 12-10-95 11 AM
No: of words 517
Copying fee 0-9-0
Comparing fee 0-2-0
Paper cost. 0-0-4 M. Shankar Rao
Copyist

Register
1064

O ...

...

૪ - ૫ - ...

...

૬

...

૭

...

૮

...

૯

...

૧૦

...

૧૧

...

...

...

166.

2/p

Wak

683

3 11 95

P.C. Enc. one
1611.

Transferred to the Secretary to the Govt. Mysuru Department.

By order

3/3/96

Ramabrahmi Mysuru
for Secretary to the Govt.

1895-96.

No. 2942.

Name of Petitioner, Bellamma, wife of Venkataiya,

Village, residing at Veeranagere

Taluk, Nagpore City

District, Mysore

Date of Arzi,

Date of Receipt, 18-2-96.

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, nil

ABSTRACT.

Reminder to her former petition dt 4-11-95, regarding her right to the Archakobip of the Anjaneyaswamy temple at Veerangere, Mysore city. States that on 23-11-95 she was informed that her petition had been sent to the Muzrai Secretary; that though she went and asked the Muzrai Secretary no reply was given to her; that upon her pressing the matter still further she was told that orders had been issued to

2389 4.4.96

5 the Deputy Commissioner for
submission of the papers regarding
her case; that on her enquiry
at the Dy Commr's Office she was
told that no such order had
been communicated to them.

Adds that the Dy Commr has
issued orders to dissuade the
Archak who was performing the
Puja on the Petr's side, from
carrying on the Puja as usual.

Prays that early orders may
be issued to the Dy Commr to allow
Petr to continue to perform
Puja pending the disposal of
her appeal-

2942

Rights assured with

ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೋರಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ನೀಡಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವುದೇ ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಸದರಿ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡಲು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೋರಿದ್ದ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ನೀಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡಲು ವಿಫಲರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರಿರುವ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯು ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲಭ್ಯವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ

Muz. 5.]

ನಂಬರ್.

1238

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಣ್ಕಚೇರಿ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ.

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ ಮಾಹೆ — ನೇ
ನುಮ್ಮಂ 1665-1034 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.
438

4/4/26

By order

Asst

Secretary

1806

COURT FEE [illegible]

[illegible] 14-6-96 [illegible]

[illegible] Ref 17.6.96

[illegible] 1986

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1665-1024 / 438 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4-4-96 [illegible]

1238 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 15-6-96

10 — 6 — 96

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1894 - 95 [illegible]

[illegible] 5 [illegible]

[illegible] 11-6-96 [illegible] 73 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1894 - 95 [illegible]

[illegible] } [illegible] 1 [illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible]

Copy applied for by Bettamma on 11-6-96

Copy ready 12-6-96

Copy delivered 12-6-96 Kelly

no: of words 320

Copying fee 4--4-4

Comparing fee 4--4-8

1897

No. 1027

Name of Petitioner Bellamma wife of

Village Venkatagiya pujari of Anjaneyaswa

Taluk in Erangere

District Mysore

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 21-10-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosures 9

Refer 8-11-97

Rep'd 5-11-97.

Rep'd 590 96

Transferred to the Secretary the Govt Mysore vide depatch

By order

November 1897

for Secretary

ABSTRACT

The petitioner states that after submitting the order appealed against, as required by Endorsement No 123 4-4-96 from the Mysore Secretary, she submitted 9 receipts to her petition She prays that her case may be dealt with an early date

2 The nine enclosures are nine postal receipts

Receipt for a Registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article No. 220 addressed to—(*Name*)

_____

_____ *Registration Clerk.*

Registration makes the transmission of a letter more secure, but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the letter be also insured. Currency notes *or* part of a Currency note **must be registered.** Coin, jewels, &c., **must be insured.** Postage and registration fee (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps. Sender should write his name and address in lower left-hand corner of envelope. Acknowledgment of delivery of a registered letter or parcel can be obtained by sender on *prepayment* of 1 anna in stamps, or an attested copy of addressee's receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on payment of 3 annas.



Value-payable.—Parcels, registered letters, and registered and unregistered book packets can be sent value-payable, the amount specified by sender being realised from addressee and paid to sender by Post Office. Railway receipts, legal deeds, bonds, promissory notes, &c., can be sent value-payable.

INSURANCE.—Parcels and registered letters can be insured without limit of value. Coin, jewels, &c., must be insured.

The public are recommended to use the embossed envelopes available at every Post Office.

Receipt for a Registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article No 525 addressed to—

(*Name*) [illegible]

P. O. of Address [illegible]

[illegible] *Registration Clerk (initials).*

Registration makes the transmission of a letter more secure, but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the letter be also insured. Currency notes or a part of a Currency note must be registered. Postage and registration fee (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps. Sender should write the name and address in lower left-hand corner of envelope. Acknowledgment of delivery of a registered letter or parcel can be obtained by sender on *prepayment* of 1 anna in stamps, or an attested copy of addressee's receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on payment of 3 annas.

Value-payable.—Parcels, registered letters, and registered and unregistered book packets can be sent value-payable, the amount specified by sender being realised from addressee, and paid to sender by Post Office. Railway receipts, legal deeds, bonds, promissory notes, &c., can be sent value-payable.

INSURANCE.—Parcels and registered letters can be insured up to the value of Rs. 1000. Coin, bullion, precious stones and jewels must be insured.

☞The public are recommended to use the cloth-lined embossed registration envelopes available at every Post Office. The price of these envelopes covers registration fee, but not postage.

Receipt for a Registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article No 535 addressed to—

(Name) [illegible]

P. O. of Address [illegible]

[illegible] *Registra*

Registration makes transmission more secure; but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the article is insured. Currency notes or a part of a Currency note must be registered. Coin, jewels, &c., must be insured. An article may be insured up to Rs. 500 at a Branch Office and up to Rs. 1,000 at other offices. Postage and registration fee (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps. Sender should write his name and address in lower left hand corner of envelope. Acknowledgment of delivery of a registered letter or parcel can be obtained by sender on *prepayment* of 1 anna in stamps, or an attested copy of address receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on payment of 3 annas.



☞ The public are recommended to use the cloth-lined embossed registration envelopes available at every Post Office. The price of these envelopes covers registration fee but not postage

Receipt for a Registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article No. **123** addressed to—(*Name*)

Reg

Registration makes the transmission of a letter more secure, but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the letter be also insured. Currency notes or a part of a Currency note **must be registered.** Coin, jewels &c **must be insured.** Postage and registration fee (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps affixed to the write his name and address in the lower left-hand corner of the cover Acknowledgment of delivery of a registered letter or parcel can be obtained by sender on *prepayment* of 1 anna in stamps or an attested copy or addressee's receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on payment of 3 annas

Value-payable.—Parcels registered letters and registered and unregistered book packets can be sent value-payable for the amount specified by sender being realised from addressee, and paid to sender by Post Office railway receipts legal access bonds, promissory notes, &c, can be sent value payable.

INSURANCE.—Parcels and registered letters can be insured without limit of value Coin, jewels, &c, must be insured.

The public are recommended to use the embossed registration envelopes available at every Post Office

Date stamp of office of posting

Receipt for a Registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article **No. 74** addressed to—

_____

_____*Registration Clerk.*

Registration ensures the transmission of a letter more secure, but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the letter be also insured. Currency notes or a part of a currency note must be registered. Coin, jewels &c. must be insured. Postage and registration fee (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps. Sender should write his name and address in lower left-hand corner of envelope. Acknowledgment of delivery of a registered letter or parcel can be obtained by sender on prepayment of 1 anna on application. Attested copy of addressee's receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on payment of 3 annas



Value-payable.—Parcels, registered letters and registered unregistered book packets can sent value-payable the amount thereof to be collected being realised from addressee, and paid to sender Post Office Railway receipts, legal deeds, bonds promissory notes &c., can be sent value-payable

INSURANCE.—Parcels and registered letters can be insured without limit of value. Coin, jewels, &c., must be insured.

The public are recommended to use the embossed registration envelopes available at every Post-Office

Receipt for a Registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article No. 269 addressed to—

me)_____

*P. O. of Address*_____

Hek. Rail

_____ *Registration Clerk* (*initials*).

Registration makes transmission more secure; but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the article is insured. Currency notes or a part of a Currency note **must be registered.** Coin, jewels, &c, **must be insured** An article may be insured up to Rs. 500 at a Branch Office and up to Rs 1,000 at other offices. Postage and registration fee (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps. Sender should write his name and address in lower left hand corner of envelope. Acknowledgment of delivery of a registered letter or parcel can be obtained by sender on *prepayment* of 1 anna in stamps, or an attested copy of addressee's receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on payment of 3 annas.

☞ The public are recommended to use the cloth-lined embossed registration envelopes available at every Post Office. The price of these envelopes covers registration fee, but not postage.

Receipt for a Registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article No. **367** addressed to—(*Name*)

Registration makes the transmission of a letter more secure, but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the letter be also insured. Currency notes form part of a currency note must be registered. Coin, jewels &c must be insured. Postage and cost for 10 (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps. Sender should write his name and address in lower left hand corner of envelope. An order to deliver or a registered letter or parcel may be obtained by sender on prepayment of 1 anna in stamps or attested copy, or addressee's receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on payment of 8 annas.



Value-payable —Parcels registered letters and registered unregistered book packets can be sent value payable the amount to be collected raised from addressee and paid to sender by Post Office Railway receipts legal deeds and promissory notes &c can be sent value payable.

INSURANCE—Parcels and registered letters can be insured to short limit of value Coin, jewels, &c, must be insured

The public are recommended to use the embossed registration envelopes available at every Post Office

Receipt for a registered Article.

RECEIVED a registered article No. 257 addressed to—(*Name*)

Registration Clerk.

Registration makes the transmission of a letter more secure, but the Post Office is not responsible for loss unless the letter be also insured. Currency notes or a part of a Currency note must be registered. Coin, jewels &c must be insured. Postage and registration fee (2 annas) must be prepaid in stamps. Sender should write his name and address in lower left-hand corner of envelope. Acknowledgment of delivery of a registered letter or parcel can be obtained by sender on prepayment of 1 anna in stamps or an attested copy of addressee's receipt can be obtained at any time within six months on prepayment of 3 annas.

Value-payable.—Parcels, registered letters and registered and unregistered book packets can be sent value-payable for the amount specified by sender being realised from addressee and paid to sender by Post Office. Railway Receipts, legal deeds, bonds, promissory notes, &c, can be sent value-payable.

INSURANCE.—Parcels and registered letters can be insured without limit of value. Coin, jewels, &c., must be insured.

The public are recommended to use the embossed registration envelopes available at every Post Office.

Rec'd. 21-10-97
AK

No. 1027

Eight annas Stamp affixed
Reference

1027. R
21-10-97

M. No. 52 Early

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1665 / 438 dated ~~without date~~ received at the Dewan's Office from Bettamma, ~~widow of [illegible] Pujari of Anjaneya temple at [illegible]~~, appealing against the ~~is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the~~ Dy Commrs order dismissing the petitioners suit claim for the sole right to the Pujarishp of the Anjaneya Swami temple @ Veeranchetty ~~forwarded~~ together with its enclosures to the D.C. Mysore District, for submission of the records connected with the case, at an early date.

By order,

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
The 16/11/ 1897

M.G.C.P.B.—20-6-94—1,000.

OFFICE
1897-98
BRANCH

357

From

The Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Mysore Bekantel

Dated 23d
Despatched
Received
November 1897

General No. 86
No.

Enclosure No. 3 + 1 file

As called for in his Office Memorandum No 526 dated 16th Instant, has the honor to forward herewith the Entire records Connected with the claim of Bellamma for the right to the Pujari thip of the Anjaneya Swamy Temple at Veerangere, Mysore

2 The petition together with its enclosures, re- -ceived with the memoranda

22/12/9

X as per accompanying Perish dated 20th November 1897

under acknowledgment is also herewith
forwarded.

for the Commissioner
Mysore District.

Read:— Petition No. 665
D/4th November 1895
from Bettamma of
Mysore appealing against
the Mysore Dy Commrs'
order D/17th Sept.r 1895
dismissing the Petrs
Suit for a declaration
of her sole right to the
Pujaviship of the Evangere
Anjaneyaswami temple
in Mysore City.

And:— Records of the case
received with the Dy
Commrs Docket. No. 86
D/23rd November 1897

No 75-7 d/22/12/97
Ein Record
Ordered thereon.

From the records

received, it is observed
that the subject of the
Petitioners' suit has
once previously come up
before Govt. in Miscellaneous
appeal Suit No. 2949
of 1892-93. In this
appeal, the Govt. after
hearing both the Petr
and the respondent
have held, in their order
dt 17th June 94, that the Petr
and the respondent
are Co-Sharers in the
Pujarishipof the temple
in question and that
therefore they might

do duties in the temple by such periodical turns as may be fixed by the Dy Commr.
An endorsement to this effect was granted to the Petr on the 17th June &
2. The Petr has ~~once more~~ instituted ~~a fresh~~ the present regular Suit on the Revenue side to establish her sole right to the Pujaruship to the exclusion of the Respondents
Even this Suit has after one enquiry by the Asst Commr Mysore ~~Dist~~ been dismissed

on ~~the~~ merits
and their order of
dismissal confirmed
by the Dy Comm^r
on appeal; ~~and the~~
Sec'y Govt after further
~~after further~~
perusal of the records
~~perusal of the records~~ ~~Her~~
see no grounds to
interfere with the
Dy Comm^r's decision.
The appeal is accordingly
rejected.

Redraft
Mrs Lacy
MWT

To Med Comm^r
Imperial
W.D. Records

Encl: 6 Pets

CM

3/5/06

ಸಚಿವರು

ಸಚಿವರ ಆಪ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

4.5.06

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/-

ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರ ಆಪ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ

ಸಹಿ/-

ಆಪ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

4.5.06

No. 54.53/22 S.W.

ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ

ಈ ರಕ್ಷಾಕಾಶಿಕೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಈ
ಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು
ಮತ್ತು ಪೋಲೀಸರು ಕ-ಮಾಂಸಿಕ ರವರಿಗೆ ~~2.5.06~~
ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿ

By order,

Sd/- 18/5/06
Secretary

Sd
17/5/06



This has probably been sent to the Mysore Secretariat before

1906

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore General and Revenue Departments

Dated 25th May

Despatched 26th May

Received

General No. 135

No.

Enclosure No. One

Srnbr. Ted

This may be filed.

N. A

29/5/06

Q.P.S. 30/5/06

With reference to the Government Proceedings No 50658 Inam dated 27th April 1906, has the honor to forward herewith a copy of Supplemental Quit-rent Register for No 643 of Kariamanta Village of Late Ashtagram now Sreerangapatam Taluk, Mysore District.

Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

of in the District of

ಕಾಯಿಂಬತ್ತೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಪೊಲ್ಲಾಚಿ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಲಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್.

tal. ಪಟ್ಟಿ.	Inam Confirmed ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯಪಲ್ಲಟ್ಟ ಇನಾಂ.			Quit Rent Government ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಪರ ಈ ವಿವರ.			Enfranchised or not. ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಯಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೆ.	Remarks. ಪರಾ.
Old Assessment. ಸಾಬಕಿ ಪೈರಿ ಜಾ.	Survey Number ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್.	Survey Acreage ಸರ್ವೆ ಪೈಜವರಿ.	Survey Assessment ಸರ್ವೆ ಪೈರಿ ಜಾ.	Former Jodi ಸಾಬಕಿ ಜೋಡಿ.	Quit-Rent now imposed. ಮಂಲಸೂರಿ ಪರ ಪಲ್ಲಟ್ಟ ವಿವರಂ	Total ಒಟ್ಟು		
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19

Supplemental Inst - Rent Register of Srirangapatna Taluk

of in the District of

ಕಾಯಿಂಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಇನಾಂಗಳ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್.

tal. ಮೊತ್ತ.	Inam confirmed. ಕಾಯಂಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಇನಾಂ.			Quit-Rent to Government. ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ವಿಟ್‌ರೆಂಟ್.			Enfranchised or not. ಕ್ವಿಟ್‌ರೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಆಯಿತೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ.	Remarks. ಪರಾ.
Old Assessment. ಸಾಬಕ ಜೇರೀಜ.	Survey Number. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್.	Survey Acrea. ಸರ್ವೆ ಬೀಜವರೀ.	Survey Assessment. ಸರ್ವೆ ಜೇರೀಜ.	Former Jodi. ಸಾಬಕ ಜೋಡಿ.	Quit-Rent now imposed. ಹಾಲಿಮೊಕರರ ಮೆಲು ಹೆಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಕ್ವಿಟ್‌ರೆಂಟ್.	Total. ಜುಮ್ಲ.		
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19

Supplemental Quit-Rent Register of Srirangapatna Taluk.

Supplemental Register of Minor Inams Confirmed in the Taluk

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Taluk 2. Hobli 3 Village	Survey No.	Name of Inamdar	Description of Inam	Condition	Description of Land	Quantity of Land	Old Assessment	Present Assessment	Remarks
Srirangapatam Calahalli Karimanki	643	Eravagere, Mysore Taluk Anjaneya Devaroo	Devadaya	For Support	"	"	"	"	"

of Code Subtaluq near Srirangapatna in the Taluk

ಶಾಯಿಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ ಚಿಲ್ಲೆಲೆ ಅನಾಂಗಳ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್.

District of Mysore.

tal. ಮು.	Inam confirmed. ಖಾಯಂಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ಇನಾಂ.			Quit-Rent to Government. ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೀಳುವಂಥ.			Enfranchised or not. ಬಿಡುಗಡೆ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದು	Remarks. ವಿವರ.
Old Assessment. ಹಳೆಯ ಪೈಸೆ ಜ.	Survey Number. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್.	Survey Acres. ಸರ್ವೆ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ.	Survey Assessment. ಸರ್ವೆ ಪೈಸೆ ಜ.	Former Jodi. ಹಳೆಯ ಜೋಡಿ.	Quit-Rent now imposed. ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ಕ್ವಿಟ್‌ರೆಂಟ್.	Total. ಜಮ್ಮ.		
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	Wet No. 121	A. G. 1-8	R. A. P. 10-10-0	"	"	"	"	This Inam was granted instead of some lands viz Survey No. 91. A. G. 4-35 Assessment 5-0-0, endowed to the Devaroo at Errangere village of Mysore Taluk taken for the extension of the Mysore city vide Govt. Gro. No. 5065-6 Mwz dt 27th April 1906.

Inam Superintendent's office
Bangalore dt 25th May 1906

Compd

J. Turner
Superintendent of Inams

Register of Minor Inams Confirmed in the Taluk

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ

1. Taluk. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು. 2. Hobli. ಹೋಬಳಿ. 3. Village. ಗ್ರಾಮ.	Serial No. ಕ್ರಮ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.	Name of Inamdar. ಇನಾಮುದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು.	Description of Inam. ಇನಾಮಿನ ವಿವರ.	Conditions of Grant. ಇನಾಮಿನ ಷರತ್ತು.	Description of Land. ಜಮೀನಿನ ವಿವರ.	Old Field Number. ಹಳೆಯ ಜಮೀನಿನ ನಂಬರ.	Old Extent. ಹಳೆಯ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ.	Former Assessment. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಕಂದಾಯ.	To be ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10